

Appl. No. : 097403,800  
Filed : February 22, 2000

#### REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 25, 2003, the Examiner rejected Claims 33, 60, 61, 63-68, 70-75, and 77-82 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. The Examiner objected to Claims 69, 76, and 83 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form of a multiple dependent claim. By this paper, Applicants address each of the issues raised by the Examiner.

#### Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent Claims 33, 60, and 61 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. By this paper, Applicants have restructured the independent Claims 33, 60, and 61 to comply with 37 CFR 1.75(i). No new matter is added by these amendments.

#### Objection to Improper Multiple Dependency of Claims

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected multiple-dependent Claims 69, 76, and 83 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) for depending from another multiple-dependent Claims 68, 75, and 82, respectively. By this paper, Applicants have amended Claim 68 to depend from Claim 66 only; thus, Claim 69's multiple dependency is now proper. Applicants have also added Claim 33 to the Claim 69's alternate dependency list.

Similarly, Applicants have amended Claim 75 to depend from Claim 73 only; thus, Claim 76's multiple dependency is now proper. Applicants have also added Claim 60 to the Claim 76's alternate dependency list.

Similarly, Applicants have amended Claim 82 to depend from Claim 80 only; thus, Claim 83's multiple dependency is now proper. Applicants have also added Claim 61 to the Claim 83's alternate dependency list.

No new matter is added by these amendments.

#### Rejection of Dependent Claims

Claims 63-68, 70-75, and 77-82 which depend from Claims 33, 60, and 61, respectively, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claims 33, 60, and 61, and because of the additional features recited therein. Applicants note that Claims

Appl. No. : 09/403,800  
Filed : February 22, 2000

67, 74, and 81 have also been amended to clarify "a discontinuous function" by adding the phrase "of the liquid level in said effluent water chamber." No new matter is added by these amendments.

Appl. No. : 09/403,800  
Filed : February 22, 2000

### SUMMARY


For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that this Application is now in a condition ready for allowance and respectfully requests the prompt allowance of the same. Should there be any impediment to the allowance of this application that could be resolved by a telephone call, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number shown below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 12-23-03

By:   
James W. Chang  
Registration No. 52,718  
Agent of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(909) 781-9231

R:\DOCS\UWC\WC-2039.DOC:hw  
122203